

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

2 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
3 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
4 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

6 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
7 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
8 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
9 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
10 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-538-8000
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

11 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
12 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
13 San Francisco, CA 94111
14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

15 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
20 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,
21 individually and on behalf of all similarly
situated,

Case No. 5:20-cv-03664-LHK-SVK

**GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME TO FILE
ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT (DKT. 136-1)**

22 Plaintiffs,

Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

23 v.

24 GOOGLE LLC,
25 Defendant.

26

27

28

Case No. 5:20-cv-03664-LHK-SVK

GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME TO FILE ANSWER TO SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT (DKT. 136-1)

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) and Civil Local Rule 6-3, Defendant Google
 3 LLC (“Google”) respectfully requests a 10-day extension to file its Answer to Plaintiffs’ Second
 4 Amended Complaint (the “Complaint”) (Dkt. 136-1). The Court issued its Order denying Google’s
 5 Motion to Dismiss on December 22, 2021 (the “Order”) (Dkt. 363), thereby making the Answer to the
 6 284-paragraph Complaint due January 5, 2022. Because that Order came down immediately prior to
 7 the year-end holidays, Google’s in-house and outside counsel’s availability to prepare the Answer has
 8 been limited. Google therefore respectfully requests a modest extension of the deadline, to January
 9 15, 2022. The parties have met and conferred, and Plaintiffs oppose Google’s request.

10 **II. STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS**

11 The relevant facts are set forth in the Declaration of Jonathan Tse accompanying this Motion
 12 (“Tse Declaration” or “Tse Decl.”).

13 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

14 Local Rule 6-3 provides that in support of a Motion to Change Time, the moving party must:
 15 (1) set forth with particularity the reasons for the requested enlargement of time; (2) describe efforts to
 16 obtain a stipulation to the time change; (3) identify the substantial harm or prejudice that would occur
 17 if the Court did not change the time; (4) disclose all previous time modifications in the case; and (5)
 18 describe the effect of the requested time modification on the schedule for the case. Google sets forth
 19 with particularity the reasons for the requested extension of time and the harm that will occur if the
 20 request is not granted below--*see infra*, Section IV. Google’s efforts to obtain a stipulation to the
 21 requested time change are described in the Tse Declaration and were unsuccessful. *See* Tse Decl. ¶ 8,
 22 9. The Tse Declaration further discloses all previous time modifications in this case and explains that
 23 the requested 10-day extension will not affect the schedule in this case. *Id.* ¶¶ 11, 12.

24 **IV. REASONS FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF TIME AND HARM THAT WILL OCCUR**

25 “When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause,
 26 extend the time ... with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the

1 original time or its extension expires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). Where good cause is shown, a
 2 request for an extension generally should be granted in the absence of bad faith by the moving party or
 3 prejudice to the adverse party. *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258-59 (9th Cir.
 4 2010). “Good cause” is a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and
 5 statutory contexts. *Id.* at 1259.

6 Because the Order was issued immediately before the holidays, Google’s counsel has had
 7 limited opportunity to prepare an Answer to the extensive Complaint, much less verify an Answer
 8 while many of Google’s employees have pre-scheduled time off work for the holidays. *See* Tse Decl.
 9 ¶7. As a result, Google faces difficulty in meeting the January 5, 2022 deadline to file its Answer. If
 10 the deadline is not extended, Google will therefore be harmed. This is sufficient to meet the “non-
 11 rigorous” good cause standard for a timely filed motion to enlarge the time to file. *Ahanchian*, 624
 12 F.3d at 1258-59 (reversing denial of motion to extend time as abuse of discretion where moving party
 13 and its counsel were “out of town over Labor Day weekend”).

14 Google diligently requested a stipulation for an extension to file the Answer. *See* Tse Decl. ¶
 15 8. On December 31, 2021, Plaintiffs stated they would not agree to Google’s request or to a further
 16 meet and confer. *Id.* ¶ 9. Plaintiffs did not articulate any prejudice they would face should Google
 17 obtain additional time to file its Answer. *Id.* ¶ 10. Indeed, the record is devoid of any indication
 18 either that an extension of time would prejudice Plaintiffs or that Google’s counsel acted in bad faith
 19 in making this request. To the contrary, Google’s request for a 10-day extension is timely, modest, and
 20 will not affect the schedule in this case. *See id.* ¶ 12.

24 **CONCLUSION**

25 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant Google’s Motion to Enlarge the Time to File
 26 its Answer to the Complaint.

1 DATED: December 31, 2021

2 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
3 SULLIVAN, LLP

4 By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro
5 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
6 andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
7 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
8 Chicago, IL 60606
9 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
10 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

11 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
12 stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
13 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
14 violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
15 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
16 Los Angeles, CA 90017
17 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
18 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

19 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
20 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
21 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
22 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
23 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
24 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

25 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
26 josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
27 1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
28 Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-538-8000
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

28 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*